

REMARKS

Claims 18-38 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 34-38 are added, and claims 20-25 and 27-31 are amended for clarity and consistency.

Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 27-29, and the acknowledgement of allowable subject matter in claims 19, 22-24 and 30-31.

The Office Action rejects claims 18, 20-21, 25-26 and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Blondeau et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,262,656). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Blondeau fails to disclose an on-chip optical interconnection circuit having a first element having a light emitting function provided on a first circuit block, and a second element having a light receiving function provided on a second circuit block, as recited in independent claim 18. The Office Action asserts at page 2 that Blondeau discloses a first element having a light emitting function ("laser") provided on a first circuit block ("L"), and a second element having a light receiving function ("detector") provided on a second circuit block ("DEC"). However, Blondeau discloses that "DEC" and "detector" are the same thing, and that "L" and "laser" are the same thing. See Blondeau at column 2 lines 59-62. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action's interpretation of Blondeau is inconsistent because it makes laser L both a first element and a first circuit block, thus making laser L "provided on" laser L. Likewise, the Office Action's interpretation makes detector DEC both a second element and a second circuit block, thus making detector DEC "provided on" detector DEC.

Furthermore, Blondeau does not disclose a first or a second circuit block. The Office Action relates Blondeau's laser L and detector DEC with circuit blocks. However, it is respectfully submitted that that interpretation is not correct because Blondeau does not disclose that laser L or detector DEC resemble a circuit block.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to new claims 34-38, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are likewise allowable. New claim 34 depends from independent claim 18, which is allowable for the reasons presented above. New claims 35-38 are allowable for the same reasons presented for claim 18, i.e., Blondeau does not disclose element "provided on" a circuit block, or a circuit block.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Steven W. Allis
Registration No. 50,532

JAO:SWA/smo

Enclosures:
Amendment Transmittal

Date: February 2, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--